THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. III. JULY, 1923. No. 7.

Suffering for Conscience' Sake a Christian Duty One Should Not Seek to Shirk.

REV. C. C. SCHMIDT, D. D., St. Louis, Mo.

It is part of true Christianity to be conscientious in one's every act. God's Word is the Christian's guide and rule of life, and his conscience binds him to follow its rule and guidance. If in any case he fails to do so, his conscience will reproach him. Therefore, if he would live conscientiously, he must bring all his actions into harmony with the teachings of the Bible. But one cannot do so without finding that many people take offense thereat. For instance, it is a matter of conscience for us to abide by the Biblical doctrine of conversion, predestination, the Sacraments *et al.;* to have no church-fellowship with all such denominations or synods as teach a doctrine different from what we know to be the truth. Our conscience being bound by the Word of God, we cannot do otherwise. But what is the consequence? People seem not to understand our position and therefore accuse us of conceit, bigotry, and of preventing Christian unity in the Church. What are we to do in the matter? We would fain avoid all this and live in peace and harmony with all that call upon the name of Jesus. But as that would mean sanctioning false doctrines and teaching otherwise than God's Word teaches, which for conscience' sake we cannot do, we must suffer uncharitable judgments and unmerited condemnation at the hands of those who would be our brethren. Yet we would rather have all the world against us than know that we are condemned by God and His Word. Ministers of the Gospel are criticized as being narrow-minded and fanatical, and they are hated by the public because for conscience' sake they refuse to officiate at some funerals or marriages or to admit unworthy communicants to the Lord's Table. And such cases are by no means rare in which earnest Christians experience enmity and annoyance from neighbors and relatives because of their Chris-

tian faith and conduct. Christians are expected to have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness. Eph. 5, 11. That hinders them from joining all such societies and associations, social and commercial, as would entangle them in anything that is sinful and displeasing to God. There are the lodges with their heathenish rites, also some trusts with their dishonest practises. But because they refuse fellowship with them, Christians must endure hatred and persecution. And if they avoid worldly pleasures and even abstain from all appearance of evil, they will surely be ridiculed and scorned as fools and hypocrites by many, even by some of those who pretend to be Christians.

But, some one will rejoin, why should a Christian undergo all such suffering if he can keep away from it? To be conscientious is good and well, but it must not be carried to extremes. Can one not be a Christian without provoking the hatred and enmity of his fellow-men, especially of those of another belief? Why should I want to be something peculiar, as though I were better than others? In answering this question, let us refer to 1 Pet. 2, 18—21. The apostle here is addressing Christians who had to suffer severely because of their being Christians. And we may imagine that the question arose in their hearts whether there was no way out for them; whether they could not be good Christians and yet be spared such suffering. But the apostle warns them against giving ear to this temptation. He says: "For this is thankworthy if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully." This means, according to Scott's Commentary, that it would be grace, or the effect and evidence of grace, "acceptable to God," and worthy of man's commendation, if, from a conscientious regard to the authority and will of God, they patiently and meekly endured such treatment as was grievous to be borne; when, not having been faulty, they were unjustly punished. — This plainly shows *that suffering for conscience' sake is a Christian duty one should not seek to shirk.*

And why should Christians not seek to avoid such suffering? Says the apostle: *"For even hereunto were ye called, because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that ye should follow His steps."* Christians are called "hereunto," namely, to suffer for conscience' sake, because Christ thus suffered for us. Christ surely was innocent in all that He suffered. He had given no cause why sufferings should be laid upon Him. *"Who did no sin."* But it was for that very reason that His enemies hated and persecuted Him, even to having Him condemned to the death upon the cross.

Could He not have avoided this? He certainly could have done so if He had shaped His life and doctrine to suit the public sentiment in order to win the praise and approval of the men in power. But this Christ could not do because *"there was no guile found in His* mouth." So He patiently endured all suffering, reviling not again when He was reviled, nor threatening when He suffered. And how could He do this? He *"committed Himself to Him that judgeth righteously."* That shows that He had a clear conscience. He knew that He was doing His Father's will, and that the Father, the righteous Judge, would take His part. So all the suffering of Christ was suffering for conscience' sake.

Now, Christ is the Lord of the Christians. They believe in Him. They glory in being His children and being of the same mind with Him. Does not everybody justly expect them to give proof of this by doing God's will faithfully and conscientiously, even if they have to suffer for it? But what is more, *the Lord expects it of them.* He has left them an example *that they should follow His steps.* He knows quite well that "all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." 2 Tim. 3, 12. Yet, He never advised His disciples not to be so anxious about doing right because of His example, nor so strict and conscientious in fulfilling God's will as they know Him to have been, lest they be hated and persecuted by men. On the contrary, He wants His disciples to follow His steps, in no wise to turn aside from the ways and rules of God's Word, and gladly to endure whatever hatred and persecution may betide them. Therefore, if a Christian is approached by the Tempter, who urges him to "be sensible" and not overconscientious, to eliminate what he knows people do not like in his religion, because he could thus save himself much trouble and annoyance, — if a Christian is thus tempted, what is he to do? Tell the Tempter what the Savior said to him, "Get thee hence, Satan!" Being a Christian, being called into communion with Christ, and having pledged Him allegiance, what else can he expect, but that the world will treat him as it treated his Lord? How could he call himself a follower of Christ if he were to violate his conscience merely to avoid being hated and spitefully entreated by men?

Come, follow Me, the Savior spake,
All in My way abiding;
Deny yourselves, the world forsake,
Obey My call and guiding.
O bear the cross, whate'er betide,
Take My example for your guide.

The apostle *offers another reason why Christians should not seek to avoid suffering for conscience' sake.* He goes on to say: vv. 24. 25. If Christians think of their *conversion* to Christ; if they consider their terrible state before conversion, and how happy and blessed they are now, they will gladly suffer for being conscientious servants of their Savior and never think of avoiding such suffering.

What kind of people are those who do not in their daily life obey the voice of conscience, but follow their carnal inclinations, hating and persecuting all such as refuse to be conformed to this world? They are those who, like sheep, have gone astray from God, turned to their own way, and were caught in the snares of the devil. They know not the Savior, and their end will be destruction. The Christians, thank God, are not like them. But was there not a time when they, too, were in that deplorable condition, to wit, previous to their conversion? Says the apostle, addressing the Christians: *"For ye were as sheep going astray."* How is it that their condition is altogether different now? "Who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed. For ye were as sheep going astray; *but ye are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls."* In order to do away with sin, which caused those who are now Christians to stray from God, Jesus bore their sins in His body on the tree, paying the penalty for them and reconciling God. And then, as their faithful Shepherd, He sought them with His saving Gospel, calling them and converting them unto Himself. Now salvation is theirs. *By His stripes they have been healed.* — Should they now deny Him before men who know Him not, and who hate Him and His believers just because they know Him not? Should they reject the Word of God for the purpose of pleasing men and gaining their good will? Should they do what displeases their Lord, merely to avoid being ridiculed and scorned by men? That surely would be a sorry kind of gratitude for the love of the Savior and His precious redemption. Now that they have been converted to the Lord and know and appreciate the great things He has done for them, they should not permit the enemies of Christ to keep them from living according to the dictates of their conscience, in accordance with God's Word, and from being willing to endure any amount of enmity and persecution at the hands of the ungodly world.

Or *did not the Lord intend this very thing* when He bore our sins on the cross, *"that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness"?* He laid into His offering the power to work in men that very condition, that one be dead to sin and live unto righteousness. That power, indeed, is meant for all men; but many, because they believe not the Gospel, do not experience it. It is the Christians only, in whom that power asserts itself. Being converted to Christ, they are moved by the power of this sacrifice. They are now dead to sin. A worldly person, when seeing any one engaged in sinful things, will not hesitate to join him, because to sin is natural with him and altogether to his liking. Not so with the Christian. The sinful things he witnesses may allure him too, but his faith will at once protest against participating in them, saying, That is not for me; that is wrong; I will keep away from it. That is Christian character. A Christian will refuse to have anything to do with sin, as though he were dead as far as sinning is concerned. He will live unto righteousness, do what is right in the sight of God, and follow the dictates of his conscience.

Now, then, if a Christian would suffer himself to be hindered from doing thus, would it not be tantamount to suffering himself to be hindered from remaining in the blessed state of conversion, from being dead to sin? Indeed, it would mean denying Christ, denying faith. By such conduct he would practically say, I am no Christian, no believer; I am an unconverted, unbelieving person. Sin, to which the Christian is dead would be revived in the heart and invited to control the soul as before. Would any Christian think of doing such a thing? No indeed! No suffering for conscience' sake can be so great and so severe as to cause a Christian to deny his being converted to his faithful Shepherd, to the Bishop of his soul.

The Eighteenth Amendment Not Moral.

Rev. N. P. N. Hvale, Minneapolis, Minn.

The governors of our States and President Harding, in conference some time ago, discussing various sides of the Prohibition Amendment, declared unanimously that Prohibition is *"not a question of morals or ethics, but purely an economic and financial question and as such should be treated by the State."*

This is verbatim their declaration as stated in various papers. I have given their words in italics in order to emphasize them.

I have always been of the same conviction as these high men, but when I asserted the truth, many church people would not listen to me.

By this statement the high conference, in my estimation, proved wiser than many ministers and churches.

Let everybody, churchman or citizen, or both in one person, take notice of the three very definite and concisely put truths which they teach; *viz.:* —

First, Prohibition is not a moral, or ethical, question.

Secondly, It is purely an economic and financial question.

Thirdly, As such it should be treated by the State.

There was a time when the work for the Eighteenth Amendment engrossed some church people to an extent as if it concerned their eternal salvation. The devil has many ways of tempting. As he tempted Adam and Eve to lust after, and take, what God had forbidden, so he now tempts men and women to refuse and despise what God, as we shall soon see, has ordained for our proper use and acceptance with thanksgiving. 1 Tim. 4, 1—5. Believing in a coming more earthly than spiritual, millennium, — a misunderstanding of Rev. 20, but in their estimation a most important thing on earth,—some church people fancied they could assist God in bringing this about by forcing in a total abstinence amendment. Yet they forgot that the end does not justify the means, and they used false arguments. I heard speakers pronounce intoxicants "devil's drinks," an expression in which there is no sense. I heard them use as their motto "Touch not, taste not, handle not," as if the words had Bible sanction. Did they not know how decidedly these words are condemned in Holy Writ, Col. 2, 22. 23? They asserted that the wine Christ made, and that the wine He Himself drank when the Pharisaic temperance people called him a "wine-bibber" (Mat. 11, 19; Luke 7, 34) was not intoxicating, although the Greek *oinos* stood there directly against them. Compare Eph. 5, 18, where the same Greek word is used.

Our statesmen in conference know better and declare that the Eighteenth Amendment, or Prohibition, is not even "a moral or ethical question," still less anything that in any way pertains to eternity; it is "purely an economic and financial question"; that is, it is only a State affair.

They seem to agree in this, that what is truly moral must not only harmonize with the Bible, but must also have man's heart in it. Since, however, the State, as such, has nothing to do with

the Bible and has no means of reaching man's heart, a truly moral work must be left to the Church, which has the means of effecting true morality and ethics.

The present State temperance and the Christian temperateness are two different things. The term temperance did not originally mean total abstinence. It can now be used only as a State-word, not as a Church-word. The Church's temperateness is not entire abstinence, but self-control in everything. 1 Cor. 9, 25. In the sense of total abstinence, I dare say after thorough study, the word temperance is found nowhere in the Bible. Wherever in our Authorized Version the word "temperance" is found, the translation ought to be *temperateness,* or still better *self-control,* and this word you will find invariably, I believe, in the Revised Version.

The statesmen in conference seem to be well enlightened also in religious things. They seem to understand that the State in our country has to do only with man's outward, superficial appearance and conduct, and this is as truly Biblical as it is Lutheran.

To natural man — and people of the State are generally but natural, not spiritual — total abstinence seems to be the surest way of preventing drunkenness, just as granting a divorce to some married people seems to be the surest way of preventing family strife. Yet the divorce laws do not extend to peaceable families, while the Eighteenth Amendment actually sets down all Americans as a set of drunkards to be held in check by this non-discriminating amendment.

Consistency, which is said to be a jewel, would require a change in the divorce laws or in the Eighteenth Amendment. Since drinking is entirely forbidden because some men get drunk, marriage should also be forbidden because some married people fight, or since divorce laws extend only to fighting families, the Eighteenth Amendment should have been so fixed as to extend only to drunkards.

Fighting has, as well as drunkenness, its root in the sinful state of man's heart, and, as stated before, with the heart the State has nothing to do.

According to the Bible, God permits men to use strong drinks, and marriage is ordained by Him. He commanded the Israelites to use wine, even "strong wine," for a drink-offering. Ex. 29, 40; Num. 28, 7, etc. As they could not offer wine without making it, the command to offer wine, of course, implied a divine order to make wine. And we find this divine order not only for the pur-

pose of offering to God, but also for man's proper and moderate enjoyment (Eccl. 9, 7; also "strong drink," Deut. 14, 26), for strengthening the body, and for medicine, not only in the Old Testament, but also in the New. Prov. 31, 6; 1 Tim. 5, 23.

Wine and, by the way, women also are some of God's gifts to man, both of which gifts are in many ways shamefully misused by man. But forbidding the use of these gifts will necessarily prove a failure.

In the eyes of the State a decent appearance of a citizen, whether this be produced by law, or whether false motives actuate such a citizen, such as to gain favor with God or respect among men, places this citizen among the good, the estimable, the praiseworthy. In the sight of the Prohibition law a man is a good man when he keeps from his stomach intoxicating spirits, although his heart may simultaneously be filled with hellish spirits, black or, perhaps white, such as filled the hearts of the Pharisees.

It is not so with God, for He looks at the heart. "Man" — in the present case the State — "looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart." 1 Sam. 16, 7. Christ says: "God knoweth your hearts; for *that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God.*" Luke 16, 15.

Also in regard to the Eighteenth Amendment, Christ is not satisfied with an external, total abstinence produced by law. He does not demand this, but He demands that the drunkard's or any other man's sinful cravings of the heart be drowned, annihilated, destroyed, when He says: "Take heed to yourselves lest at any time your *hearts* be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness." Luke 21, 34.

To affairs of this world — politics, business, etc. — a Christian may straightly and honestly put only head and hand, but in his relation to God and in religious things he must have his heart, and indeed a heart with faith, for without faith it is impossible to please God (Heb. 11, 6), and here it is true that what is not of faith is sin (Rom. 14, 23), for which reason a church father says of heathen virtues that they are but glittering vices. What is often called good or great works or gifts may be of great service to those for whom they are done, but if done from false motives, they are worse than nothing in the eyes of God. Christ rebuked the Pharisees for doing "all their works to be seen by men." Matt. 23, 5.

If we lived only for this life, then outward deeds, outward decent appearance, would be all that would be necessary; for then there would be no God to look on our hearts. If the State can put through an amendment acknowledging that we are descendants of apes, as some claim, even professors and ministers, there need be no great worry about eternity; there would be little difference between man and beast.

But because God looks on the heart, the true Christian *temperateness* cannot fall in with the State temperance or, which is the same, the world's temperance. Christ's kingdom, also in this respect, is not of this world. Take notice that Christ pronounced these words not to an ordinary citizen, but to a prominent and not entirely unconscientious officer of the government. John 18, 36.

Also the secular government, it is true, is instituted by God, but only for the sake of outward peace and external order. Rom. 13; Matt. 22, 21. If our country was on the way to ruin before the enactment of the Eighteenth Amendment, which, I understand, is generally denied, the amendment was proper. For as the single individual, when a drunkard (Prov. 23, 29—31 speaks of a drunkard), is forbidden to "look upon the wine when it is red," so also a whole country, if turning to drunkenness, ought, by the government, to be prevented from "looking on the wine."

The questions, however, in this connection, which I shall not attempt to settle, are these: Was our country so deeply infatuated with the vice of drunkenness that a total abstinence law became necessary? and, Was there, in this country of liberty, no better and wiser way of curing drunkenness than by enacting a total abstinence amendment?

There is, according to Scripture, also another kind of intoxication, which ought not to be overlooked. Is. 29, 9 describes this: "They are drunken, but not with wine; they stagger, but not with strong drink." If one is called "wet," the other may be called "dry." One is to fill the stomach with what is commonly designated as intoxicants, the other is to fill the head with fanaticism and folly. The two seem to be against each other, and probably were, as the agitation for the Eighteenth Amendment was going on. The "dry" conquered, but many wise men now claim that it would have been better for the peace and prosperity of our country if the amendment had run against the "dry" intoxication as strongly as it now runs against the "wet." As to their effects the two are much alike; they differ chiefly in the stuff imbibed. It is also

difficult for people to understand the danger of the "dry," for the greatest "dry drunkards" commend it and have a way of making it appear as if it were a virtue instead of a vice. Total abstinence from "dry" intoxication has Scripture on its side; the "wet" has not. Compare 1 Tim. 4; 3. 4.

As Christians we are members of the Church of Christ, and that is the main thing. We are bound more closely together as Christians than as citizens, for we constitute one spiritual body (1 Cor. 12, 27; Eph. 5, 30), while as citizens we are only members of the State, forming with others an outward political union.

As Christians our most important service to the country is missionary work among the many civilized heathen citizens. In making men Christians we make them also the best of citizens. As members of the State, *i. e.*, as citizens, we seek the welfare of the State or, as Scripture expresses it (Jer. 29, 7), "the peace of the city." But in our country we are not to have anything to do with affairs of our Government as Christians, but as citizens or, if you prefer, as Christian citizens.

Since the State has established total abstinence, and since abstinence from one or another of God's gifts, even when commanded to be used, does not in every case involve sin, we can as obedient citizens submit to the law. But to men as Christians this law is an encroachment upon religious liberty, and to men as citizens it encroaches upon civil liberty, and both these liberties are guaranteed in this country by constitutional documents. I here consider our rights from the fundamental principles and original constitutional standpoint. Without sanctioning the term "liberty" in all its colonial aspects or other misuses, it cannot be denied that it was the passe-partout to "Americanism." "Death" was claimed preferable to failure of obtaining "liberty."

Those who differ with me look on the present political and practical side of the question. They ignore retrospection and demand unconditional so-called advancement, the final end of which they are wise enough not to let us know. But they will tell us not to complain of encroachment on liberties; for our legislators are representatives of all citizens and act in the name of all. They are chosen by a majority, and there is no restraint laid upon the majority to protect the minority against possible injustice.

In State affairs, reason is the guide, and any measure sustained by somewhat reasonable arguments will carry if the propounder has

patience enough and money enough to work for it, invigorate and reiterate his arguments, if necessary for fifty to seventy-five years.

But an important Christian reason for submitting to the law is the avoidance of giving offense to such Christians as are weak, but sincere, and who, in their ignorance, believe it wrong to use intoxicants, or who hold total abstinence to be a Christian virtue. As St. Paul says: "None of us liveth to himself"; and: "If thy brother" — let us stress the word "brother" — "be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died." Rom. 14, 7. 15.

To vain, conceited, aggressive, self-righteous hypocrites, however, we are not, I believe, to "give place by subjection." We are to consider them as St. Paul does, as "false brethren, who come in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage." Gal. 2, 4. 5. Christ Himself did not mind the Pharisees when they called Him a "wine-bibber." He simply blamed them for doing so. And if any total abstainer, in "spying out the Christian liberty," had entered the wedding-chamber in Cana and rebuked Christ for "setting a bad example," he would not have gained much. Also when the Lord was censured for permitting His disciples to "eat and drink" while the disciples of John and of the Pharisees were fasting, He knew how to defend His children against such Pharisaic accusation. He tells them and us that His children constitute His bride, and He, our Bridegroom, is with us, so that we need fast neither bodily nor spiritually. Luke 5, 23, etc.

I myself am an abstainer, not because of the law or for fear of any "devils' drinks," nor because I consider my abstinence a moral act or a virtue; it is only because I never felt the need of ardent drinks.

In declaring Prohibition to be neither moral nor esthetic, the conference men, having noticed how active some churches still are in the interest of total abstinence, doubtless mean to warn them that, as churches, they need not trouble much about it; for it is "not moral or esthetic." But, of course, as citizens they are not excluded from taking part in it as an "economic and financial affair"; for, the conference says, as such it should be treated, not by the Church, but by the State.

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

The Lutheran Seminary at Gettysburg, Pa., reports the graduation of a class of fifteen, as well as the death of Dr. T. C. Billheimer, *Professor emeritus* of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, on February 10. D.

A student's distress that cannot be relieved by money is voiced in the following letter to Dr. G. T. Rygh, which is published in the *Lutheran Church Herald* (May 15): "I wish to express my appreciation of the efforts which are being made to check antichristian teachings at the university. I am a Lutheran. I feel that some of the instruction that has been given me in various departments, especially biology and anthropology, has been almost antagonistic enough to shake a strong faith from its foundations. It is only through a sincere intercourse with God that I have been able to cling to Christ, the only solid Rock. My anthropology instructor started the first lecture of the course by stating that Christianity had adopted the ancient Hebrew mythology as doctrine. It is all good and well to say that we need not accept their statements, but when the Christian faith is made the laughing-stock of the class, I think it is going too far. I am in full sympathy with the movement to check the teaching of antichristian doctrine. I am praying to God to open our eyes to the truth. 'Make haste to answer me, O Lord; my spirit faileth! Hide not Thy face from me, lest I become like them that go down into the pit.' Ps. 143, 7." — These things are suggested by our reading of this melancholy letter: 1. Christian students must remonstrate against attacks upon their religion in the classroom, either by speaking out in class, if that is practicable, or in some other way. The duty of confessorship requires this of them. If their remonstrance is not heeded, they should leave the institution. 2. The churches should give every instance of this kind prompt and pitiless publicity. We pay our taxes to support our universities. We do not expect them to teach our religion, but neither do we expect them to attack our religion and have us pay them for doing so. If infidels need universities, let them build them and support them. The universities belong to the States, which protect all religions. 3. The cheapest, meanest, and most cowardly attacks upon Christianity are those made by professors in their lectures to students, the majority of whom are awed into silence by the superiority of their teacher, while not a few of them, usually the shallowest minds, will curry favor with the professor by applauding his infidel *ex cathedra* exhibitions. D.

The defeat of Mr. Bryan for the moderatorship of the Presbyterian General Assembly at Indianapolis on May 17, after several ballots, can be only partly ascribed to the fact that he is a layman, not capable of dealing with the doctrinal matters of the Church and issues that confront the ministry. Mr. Bryan has made himself *persona non grata* with a powerful element in the Presbyterian Church by his attacks on evolution, perhaps also by his syndicated Bible-studies published by the secular press. This fact shimmers through the re-

mark credited to a leading member of the General Assembly that Mr. Bryan's election would have endangered the cohesion of the conservative and the liberal elements in the Presbyterian Church. With its unscriptural teaching regarding divine saving grace and the means of grace, conservatism does not mean much in the Presbyterian Church. Nevertheless it is a melancholy spectacle to behold a large body of churchmen that was known for its rugged adherence to its creed forsake its doctrinal standards at a point that concerns all Christians alike. How feeble confessional consciousness among Presbyterians has become was revealed lately when the Presbytery of New York, according to a report in the *United Presbyterian,* "by an overwhelming majority voted down all resolutions censuring Dr. Fosdick," who, though belonging to a different church-body, serves a prominent Presbyterian church on Fifth Avenue and is a lecturer at Union Seminary, that theological *enfant terrible* of the Presbyterian Church. Dr. Fosdick had made himself obnoxious to an earnest element among the Presbyterians by his extreme liberalism, alias rationalism. Dr. John Robertson, after the vote, announced that he intended to withdraw from the Presbyterian Church and apply for orders in the Episcopal Church. In view of the fact that by such withdrawal Dr. Robertson would merely exchange fellowship with the rationalist Fosdick for fellowship with the rationalist Percy S. Grant, the *United Presbyterian* applies to him the old proverb: Out of the frying-pan into the fire. May not the Lutheran Church with its loyal Bible-faith some day become the asylum for such as are fleeing from the attacks of modernist and liberalistic unbelief? The deplorable condition in the Presbyterian Church again excites the old wonder: How much infidelity Christians are made to pay for! If infidels had to finance their own mission, establish and maintain their own schools and organism, how much would they achieve? Injecting themselves into the body of the Church like bacilli, they draw rich nourishment from the body which they ultimately destroy. In passing, it may be suggested that modern Presbyterian literature and bookstores can offer little to Lutheran pastors that could be of value to them, except for a study of what ought not to be. D.

A Word on Christian Education by Roger W. Babson. — "In a paper published in the *Continent,*" writes the *Biblical Review* (April, 1923), "Mr. Roger W. Babson makes an urgent plea that the Church take a more active part in determining the nature and conduct of various lines of business, looking to their broader service of the public. His opening paragraph concerns certain powerful rivals of the public school in molding the lives of the children: 'Once the Church and the home actually directed the education of the children. Then this education was gradually turned over to the public schools. It was felt that this could be safely done. The influence of the Church and of the home has greatly decreased as the public school system has grown. Furthermore, the public schools have largely become a football for politics. As a result the public schools are not educating our young people. The great educational forces to-day are

the newspapers, the movies, and the bill-boards. These are all private enterprises and operated for profit. Ownership of newspapers varies in different communities. Many newspapers are a power for good, but many others are a power for evil. The movies, which are a tremendous factor in the education of our young people, are mostly in the hands of Jews, and rather a low class of Jews at that. This is not a criticism of the Jews. They are at perfect liberty to operate movies for the Jewish peeople and use them to educate their own Jewish children, but it seems very paradoxical to have Jews operate the movies for Christian children. As for the bill-boards, they are largely supported by the tobacco interests and are mostly devoted to encouraging our young people to smoke.'" MUELLER.

Is Christianity Dead? — In reply to this question the *Christian Herald,* April 28, 1923, says: "Sir Conan Doyle, who is in this country lecturing on spirit communication and exhibiting what he claims are spirit photographs, says, 'Christianity is dead.' And the reason he gives is 'the failure of Christianity to stop the Great War.' By the same reasoning Sir Arthur might conclude that 'God is dead,' inasmuch as He did not stop the war, or because He does not put an end to all human selfishness and wrong. It is a common mistake to lay the blame for conditions in the world upon some form of universal truth or belief rather than upon the failure of those who profess such a belief to practise it. Christianity is no more to blame for not stopping the war than the sun is to blame for not shining on a man who goes into a dark room and shuts his eyes. Christianity is not dead, but human beings who are not practising its love and light are dead. As the great Apostle says: 'For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.' That power is the most living force in the world to-day. But it cannot express itself except through those who believe, any more than an electric radio message can express itself without a wire and a radio contact." MUELLER.

The Nineteenth Amendment? — Will it be the prohibition of the use, etc., of tobacco or the embodying of the name of Jesus Christ in the Constitution of our country? Appeals reach us for either measure. In a choice between the two we could suffer the former measure to be inflicted on the nation, but we should cry out against the latter, which is vigorously advocated by the Witness Committee of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, with offices at 119 Federal St., N. S., Pittsburgh, Pa. Christ desires no such recognition from any person or people, but spurns it as He spurned the crown, though He is a King. If America came to Him with such an offer, He would again say: "Get thee behind Me, Satan!" He receives only those who come to Him repenting of their sins and believing in His mercy for forgiveness. There is reason to believe that a majority of the citizens of the United States have not the least inclination thus to come to Christ. But they might vote for the amendment and congratulate themselves on having paid a fine compliment to Christ that cost them not even the twenty-seven cents that they pay to see Christ in the

movies and applaud Him. Then, after we have voted Christ into our Constitution, we may get Moses in, too, to please our Hebrew fellow-citizens, and Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy, to please the Christian Scientists, and Manitou for the original Americans, and Confucius for the Chinese, etc. Would it not be fair? And then we shall turn the cupola of our Capitol into an American pantheon that will surpass its defunct Roman predecessor in variety and grotesqueness. D.

Anniversary of Odd-Fellowship Celebrated. — "The Fraternal Idea" was the subject of an address delivered Sunday by Rev. Dr. J. Bradley Markward, pastor of the First Lutheran Church, at the Ohio Odd-Fellows' home chapel, as part of the program in celebration of the 104th anniversary of the founding of the Independent Order of Odd-Fellows. The program began at 2.30 P. M., and members of the order went to the home at 2.15 P. M. In his remarks Dr. Markward said that the fraternal idea grew out of the fact that people are gregarious and like to get together in groups. He said that people want to share their emotional experiences because of their mutuality; that they want to enjoy the mutual aid theory; that they wish to help one another, to serve one another, and to protect one another. The home chapel was filled with members of the order and friends. Music was furnished by the boys' band of the home and the home chorus. Rev. Ira McLaughlin, pastor of the Universalist church, gave the opening and closing prayers. The committee in charge of the affair was composed of Charles Baxter and Fred Smith. (*Springfield* [Ohio] *Daily News,* April 30, p. 12.) We shall be glad to announce that this publication is a newspaper fake. D.

Sir Arthur Conan Doyle Again. — Depending upon the gullibility of the American public for ample box office receipts, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle is again touring the country with his spiritistic propaganda. Relative to his superstitious tenets, the *Catholic World* writes: "Witness Conan Doyle, who has been again 'in our midst.' He is the son of an Irish Catholic. He was educated, partially, at a Catholic college. But Catholicism could not hold him. Presumably it was a strain upon his reason. Now he is telling the world — at somewhat advanced box office prices — what he has found in place of the Catholic religion to meet the exacting demands of his intellect, and to assuage the hunger of his soul. In an interview given to the New York newspaper men, he says that he believes in fairies, which are 'elementals.' 'An elemental,' he explains solemnly, 'may be a fairy or a spirit, good or evil.' 'And do you think that there may be spirits of the woods and trees?' Sir Arthur was asked. 'O yes, there may be,' he answered. 'Nature is never empty, I am sure.' — He also believes in witchcraft. 'There is,' he says, 'black magic, witchcraft. There isn't any doubt that witchcraft is perfectly real. . . . The ancient Egyptians had powers that we know nothing of. They may easily have used these powers, occult and otherwise, to defend their graves. They were always opposed to digging up the mummies.' So Lord Carnarvon's death was very probably the result of a curse proclaimed by King Tut-Ankh-Amen."

Equally interesting are the comments of the same journal on Sir Arthur's oracles concerning social conditions in the other world. We read: "Sir Arthur has definite ideas about social conditions in the other world. The reporters asked him if he thought Lord Carnarvon would meet the king whose laws he had violated. 'Not unless the king was a terrible rotter,' was the answer. 'Otherwise he would have risen far above the plane on which a newly disembodied spirit would enter.' Sir Arthur constantly receives help from the other world. 'I have a guide,' he says, 'who is most helpful to me. He is an Arabian who lived three thousand years ago. He has given me the most valuable advice many times when I had problems to solve.' We think Dr. Doyle could get better advice without going so far for it. Some of the spirits, it seems, must be corporeal. We used to think that a ghost was intangible and elusive. We never thought, in the old days, when grandmothers' tales took the place of scientific psychic research, that a ghost could shake hands with you or let your children sit on its knee. But we have Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's word for it that the spirit of Kate King often used to come to the house of Sir William Crookes and 'dandle his children on her knee.' Recently Sir Arthur asked one of Crookes' children if she remembered Kate King, and she said she would never forget being held on the knee of that departed spirit. This opens up great possibilities, especially for these days, when the servant problem is so acute. Why not summon spirits to wash the dishes and scrub the floors and make the beds, as well as to dandle the children on their knees? If there are fairies in the woods and trees, there must be fairies in the kitchens. And if they have nothing to do on the other side, they would probably welcome a little employment over here. No doubt the 'little people' would be more satisfactory than those to whom our modern householders pay such high wages with such poor results." MUELLER.

To Draw and to Win.—The Biblical Review (April, 1923) quotes the *Canadian Lutheran* on the important topic of the Christian pastor's real work, which deserves careful perusal. The quotation follows: "The preacher's function is not that of drawing or that of holding; it is that of preaching, and that primarily alone. His mind is not to be taken up with distracting anxiety as to how to get men to come to him. His absorbing thought should be to present the truth so as to get men to come to Christ. The preacher who is an adept at 'drawing' congregations is, in ninety-nine cases out of every one hundred, a failure at winning souls. Unconsciously it may be, yet too surely, he yields to the temptation of tickling ears rather than fulfilling his obligation of touching and reaching hearts. This, we say, is almost invariably true of one who thinks much about 'drawing.' But it is equally true that he who, possessing average ability and making a consecrated use of it in the study of the Word, of nature, of providence, and of man, gives himself to the work of winning souls will be a drawing preacher. At the same time, it is in the power of a church to do either of two things with those who are drawn to it: to thaw them in or to freeze them out. We say 'thaw them in,' that is,

by manifestation of a truly Christian love, move them to a more and more complete identification of themselves with the Church in its various expressions of life and activity. Love on the part of the people more than the eloquence of the pastor will hold a congregation together, while, on the contrary, indifference and coldness and clique spirit on the part of the people, despite all the ability shown in the pulpit and by the pastor, will serve to dissipate any congregation."

MUELLER.

France Requires Protection Against the Laws of Nature. — In the March issue of *Revue Contemporaine* two writers discuss the French problem of national security and sufficient safeguards for their country against aggression. The first writer declares: "France is slowly dying. Every year the number of deaths exceeds that of births, and since the war the condition which was critical before has become serious." The writer asserts that, unless internal causes now operating towards the decay of the French nation are stopped, one may say with almost mathematical accuracy that within twenty-five years the native population of France will be reduced from 40 to 25 million. That will be the time when "a foreign nation which everybody knows" will fall upon France, reduce it to a colony, and, in general, place it under tutelage. The second writer also speaks of "a crisis that is without parallel in the civilized world, and that saps the foundation of the French nation's existence." He figures out that the depopulation of France proceeds at the rate of 200,000 inhabitants per annum. On the other hand, French sociologists and statisticians point with alarm to the prolific increase by natural growth of the nation across the Rhine. The millions of children and youths growing up in Germany have given France a terrible nightmare. Against this danger protection must be provided at any cost and by whatever means. — Now, it is likely that the decadence of the native French stock is just now overemphasized for political purposes and to solicit sympathy. But suppose matters are as bad as Frenchmen picture them, does a nation like theirs that is cankered with extreme immorality deserve to be protected against a nation in which the laws of the Creator are still obeyed to some extent? Ethics and equity answer, No. The prolific state of the German nation is also stressed by French writers beyond the limits of truthfulness, likewise for political purposes. But, granted the prolific conditions are as pictured, who has the right to criticize them or to alter them? Is not the murderous devil in several distinct ways inspiring French arguments for protection?

D.

Fascism.—From an autobiographic article of Mussolini in *Gerarchia,* the Fascist review, the Fort Wayne *Journal-Gazette* (March 31) quoted the following remarks on liberty: "Men nowadays are tired of liberty. Both in Russia and in Italy it has been demonstrated that it is possible to govern outside, above, and against all liberal ideas. Neither Communism nor Fascism has anything to do with liberty. . . . Liberty is no longer a chaste, severe maiden for whom generations in the first half of the last century fought and died. For the intrepid,

restless youths who are now in the dawn of a new history other words exercise a greater fascination, namely, order, hierarchy, and discipline. Fascism is not afraid to declare itself illiberal or antiliberal. It has already passed, and, if necessary, will again pass, without the slightest hesitation, over the body, more or less decomposed, of the Goddess of Liberty." — Thus speaks the friend and ally of the Roman Pope.

D.

A German View of American Charities. — In the German *Reichstag* Representative Lauscher recently said: "America is at the head of all nations in rendering humanitarian aid to our sufferers." To this sentiment the *Koelnische Zeitung* (May 2) takes exception as follows: "The statement is dangerous — and it is *false*. It is dangerous because many of our people will again have their hopes directed to the magnanimous country, only to meet with another disillusionment; and it is false *because America has actually done nothing at all for our sufferers*. All the aid that has been rendered from over yonder — and there is an infinite amount of it — cannot be credited to America, but *solely and only to the German-Americans*. America has not the least share in this unparalleled relief activity of Americans of German extraction. In our German publicity we have to be careful to keep strict and correct account. Honor and gratitude to whom honor and gratitude are due. But America as such has no share in it, nor can it claim any. This fact should be borne in mind also by men who speak from the rostrum of the *Reichstag*. When such assertions as those of Representative Lauscher are scattered broadcast throughout the country and go uncontradicted, they cause harm and are resented principally by the true givers in America, especially when they are not even mentioned by name, as happened day before yesterday. The organ of the Centrum Party, *Germania*, which is in close relation to Representative Lauscher, on March 8 reviewed the account which Professor *Hengesbach* gave of his journey to America and the impressions he received, and nailed down the fact that even the Catholic Knights of Columbus are not just to the Germans; 'for it is poor evidence of their neutrality to arrange an exceedingly fulsome reception for Cardinal Mercier, to appoint Marshal Foch an honorary member of their society, and to make a contribution of $65,000 for a monument to Marquis Lafayette, *while they have not a cent for the misery in Central Europe*.' The same is true of the Protestants, unless they are Germans, and *official America* so far has not stirred a finger in an effort to 'place itself at the head of all nations in rendering aid to our sufferers.' Not even the *American* Red Cross, which, in the days when America was neutral, served as a recruiting station, had anything to give to German sufferers until January 25, when it finally forwarded $25,000 to the German Red Cross. On March 10 the Washington correspondent of the Chicago *Abendpost* investigated the Red Cross and found that the only organization that could help, after Congress had failed to help, *the Red Cross, was not doing anything either, nor did it intend to do anything*. The reason given at the headquarters in Washington was that

'no request for aid had been received.' In unmeasured abundance a stream of offerings from the Red Cross is flowing to Armenia: in round figures $15,000,000 was sent to that country during the last twelve months. In addition to this, 600,000 tons of clothing and shoes were forwarded during the last months. Congregations and individuals of every denomination were requested to adopt Armenian children at an expense of $5 a month per child. Hundreds of thousands of children were cared for in this manner. Others were fed and clothed in orphanages that had been erected for them. The Greek Government even donated the German Emperor's palace at Korfu for this purpose, and 3,000 children were sheltered in this building. President *Harding* issued two calls for aid to Armenia, and they proved effective. Moreover, he promised his aid toward obtaining *from the next Congress an appropriation of at least $20,000,000.* What has he done for Germany? In the Ruhr District thousands of persons are driven from house and home, families are deprived of their supporters, milk is taken away from children. The American Red Cross does not notice these things, neither do the American reporters in Duesseldorf and Essen. For the sufferers are only Germans, don't you know! On March 14 the *Milwaukee Herold* reported that Secretary of Commerce *Hoover had denied in decided terms* that an extensive feeding of children at the expense of the American Government was being planned, but he referred to a rumor that a delegation of Quakers would thoroughly investigate conditions in Germany, especially in the Ruhr District. The report concludes with these words: 'However, as stated, a relief action on the part of the American Government will be taken under advisement only in an extreme emergency, that is, if Germany were reduced to *actual famine conditions,* because very influential interests and numerous 'patriots,' chiefly, however, *political clubs of women, are decidedly opposed to rendering aid to the former enemy.* In this connection we may refer to a *letter,* addressed on November 7, 1919, to Miss Dierkes by Mr. James Jackson, the Division Chief of the American Red Cross at Boston. Miss Dierkes had inquired whether the contributions to the American Red Cross which were actually demanded from German Americans were being used in proper proportion for hungering and dying children in Germany and Austria. Here is the answer she received: 'You inquire, in the second place, about our disposition of stores for Europe. *We are working only* in the countries of our allies and distribute our stores only to them. *Our only work done in Germany* was in behalf of *prisoners from our allies,* especially Russian prisoners. In reply to your third question regarding *our relief work for children in Europe,* I would say that this work is being done on the largest scale in France and Servia. *I can assure you that we are not doing any work of this kind in Germany and Austria!'* This letter is quite in harmony with the attitude of the chairman of the American Red Cross, Mr. Davidson, who declared some time ago that *German-Americans* would not be *permitted* to engage in works of charity in war territory, even though ten times as many of their sons

were on the firing-line! It is necessary to recall some of these details in order occasionally to quicken the memory of our own people. This may help to render such assertions as those of Professor Lauscher in the *Reichstag* impossible in the future. We are willing to express our gratitude, but it should be directed to the correct address. This address, to which we cannot make our gratitude too abundant, is not America, but *the German-Americans.*" (Italics by *Koeln. Zeitung.*) We have been told in impudent fashion what France thinks of us after the war. Only recently England expressed in speeches and cartoons how disgusted it is with us. Russia has denounced us; Turkey has spoken contemptuously about us. Now comes Germany with a bill of indictment against us for unscrupulous unfairness. Travelers in Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark, Poland, etc., have heard remarks about America that are not pleasant to relate or to listen to. That is what we have achieved by our generous, high-minded, ideal motives for entering the war in Europe. And these mutterings are only the first-fruits of our coming harvest. We are going to reap a bumper crop of hatred and contempt, not mentioning the frauds that our own 'patriots' have committed against us right here in our country. As to the German complaint which we have restated in full, that, too, is the forerunner of other remarks. Leaving the justice of the complaint out of the discussion and discounting the praise of German-Americans in which the German writer indulges, the article breathes resentment, and that resentment will grow and ultimately will not stop at an undefinable ethnological line. American benefactors of German sufferers must be prepared to receive scorn and contempt from those whom they now support. Notwithstanding this, we, on our part, will continue the work which we are doing for suffering Germans, not as German-Americans, but as Christians, and remember 1 Pet. 2, 20. It is quite noticeable, moreover, that under the continued pressure of all sorts of misery German nerves are going to pieces, and much patience with German utterances about America will be necessary in the future. D.

Germany. — Genuine ecclesiastical Bourbons are the former supporters of the German state-church system: they learn nothing, and they forget nothing. The constitution of the new German Republic has laid down for all Germany the principle of the separation of Church and State. The various church-bodies of Germany, accordingly, proceeded to effect a new organization, resp. reorganization. The constitutional principle is not yet realized; not a few of the leading churchmen are slow in effecting the necessary changes and want to retain as much as possible of the old system. Strange things occur: In Prussia they are debating the question whether the new constitution of the former *Landeskirche* must be submitted to the Diet for approval, and Dr. Reinhard, who died recently, had to point out the silliness of the idea to have a legislature composed partly of Catholics, Jews, infidels, and declared enemies of the Church determine what the new evangelical Church of Prussia is to be like. — In a discussion of Art. 24 of the new constitution of the Evangelical

Church a motion prevailed to strike the clause that the elders of the congregation have the right and the duty "to be concerned about the preaching of the divine Word and all ministrations within the congregation." The clergymen present declared that by this arrangement the elders might feel authorized to oppose doctrinal "views" of pastors that are contrary to the accepted standards. They desired to retain their doctrinal independence; in other words, German theologians who have created the worst confusion in the Protestant churches of Germany propose to continue the confusion. — The Consistory of Saxony has fined Pastor Dr. Mehlhose M. 1,000 for publishing an article in which he advocated giving the modern church an airing by which "the hallowed atmosphere of the Middle Ages" and "the dogmatic hymns and prayers of the sixteenth century" would be expelled. But Dr. Mehlhose is retained as a member of the ministerium. — In the *Neue Saechsische Kirchenblatt* a writer argues that after the demise of the former church controlled by the government a spirit of liberty and democratic institutions must be fostered by which the people would be joined to a new *Volkskirche*. The writer does not seem to realize what sacrifices of Scriptural principles this *Volkskirche* would have to make to get the *Volk*, that is, the people *en masse*. — Ministerial Director Dr. Hedrich proposes to make the new church popular and induce greater interest in it and especially financial cooperation on the part of the people by casting out of it "the ballast of old institutions" and thoroughly liberalizing it to make it agreeable to modern man. Dr. Amelung has to point out to him that this means casting out the teaching of Jesus, the Savior of sinners, and driving the very people that still want a church away from it. — In the Province of Hannover the executive committee of the "Vereinigung der Bekenntnisfreunde in der hannoverschen Landeskirche," under the leadership of Pastor Goudefroy, are protesting against the adoption, by the framers of a new constitution for the Church of Hannover, of a paragraph that is "to protect minorities" in the Church. This means that if any person or group of persons is not satisfied with the teaching of Scripture and the Lutheran Confession in his congregation, he may demand service by another pastor more to his liking. Dr. Laible expresses his painful surprise at beholding the spectacle of labored efforts by the builders of the new church to find a formula by which those who confess and those who deny the truth can be brought into the new organization. He calls the formulas which are embodied in the new church constitutions of Germany "a symbol of internal untruth." Pastor Goudefroy's society also protests against retaining Dr. Doerris, the author of *Believing in the World* (*Der Glaube an die Welt*), in the ministry of the Church of Hannover because he is practically an infidel. Dr. Haccius, of Hermannsburg, regards the situation in the Church of Hannover as very critical, but does not feel a sufficient urge to joy in the protest of the Goudefroy people. — In view of the appointment of the radical Professor Heitmueller, of Marburg, as successor of Professor Schlatter at Tuebingen, which has roused the resentment of conservative elements especially throughout Wuerttemberg,

Pastor Hartwig Harms, of Hamburg, advocates the erection of seminaries as the only way in which the Lutherans of Germany can hope to obtain orthodox pastors. — Prof. Dr. Bornhausen, of Breslau, appeals to the state for protection of his liberal views against those who want to force a certain confessional declaration upon the new church. Dr. Dibelius, of Berlin, comforts him by saying that any confessional preambles adopted for the new church would have no normative force whatsoever. — Dr. Wuensche, of Loebau, Saxony, who quit the church and became an active Social Democrat, has been appointed Supreme Counselor in the *Kultusministerium,* the department of the government which regulates church affairs. — Addressing a class of graduates at Dresden, *Oberlehrer* Rau scandalized his audience by remarks like these: 1. Those guilty of the most inhuman acts in history are the rulers and the Church. Even in antiquity Socrates suffered inhuman treament from the state, but he bore up under his fate manfully and did not whine like the One on the cross: "My God, My God," etc. 2. What harm is there in having illegitimate children? None. 3. Why, what was the Virgin Mary? Did not she, too, have an illegitimate child? 4. Who is God? Formerly we had a Jewish, an Evangelical, and a Catholic god; after that we even had a Prussian god. But this latter was deposed and another put in his place. Complaint having been made to the city authorities about this address, the teacher sent a written apology to them — and remained in office. — Of all infidels and skeptics the Germans are the nastiest. Their unbelief is frequently steeped in cynicism of the vilest sort, the "dirty dog" type: they revel in obscene and sacrilegious remarks. — As regards the architects of the new German *Volkskirche,* it seems as if they are at times purposely blind to the plain teaching of Scripture on what constitutes the Church, in which spiritual rights are vested, how men are made members of the Church, how a Christian congregation is organized, built up, and governed in accordance with God's Word, etc. Most of them loathe the idea of free, self-sustaining and self-governing organizations of believing Christians. The free-church idea is denounced as an American importation, oftentimes as "Missourianism," and the people are warned against it as something worse than American Russellism, Christian Science, the ruthless sectarianism of Baptists, Methodists, Adventists, etc. Leading German churchmen will stomach anything, it seems, except a confessional Lutheran of the Missouri Synod type. There are American Lutherans in Europe fraternizing with the left-overs of the former *Landeskirche* and advocates of the new *Volkskirche.* By connivance at least they sanction views and doings in Germany which they would not dare to sponsor in America. D.

Regarding the Eisenach World Conference of Lutherans we learn from the *Lutheran* (May 17) that "in agreement with the Central Committee of Europe the National Lutheran Council has determined to stick to the business of the kingdom of God (matters of Christian doctrine and practise) and to lift the convention into the higher realm where the wicked state questions (occupation of the

Ruhr District, the League of Nations, the Versailles Treaty, the question of boundary lines, etc.) cease from troubling and Christian brethren, weary of earth's turmoils, may be at peace." The editor thinks that Lutheran laymen in America would prefer removing the ravages of war in Europe to "harping upon the old strings of doctrine and practise." "If all of the Lutheran bodies subscribe to the same confession or confessions, why discuss doctrine and practise? Is not the great question of faith fixed and settled for all time? Why not give such matters a rest and attend to the burning practical issues of uniting our Lutheran forces the world over to meet conditions so critical as to threaten the very existence of the Lutheran Church in many sections?" Rightly the editor says: "Subscription to the confessions does not settle the question of faith and unity." Not if the subscription is a mere lip-profession, without the proper accompanying action. Rightly, too, the editor holds that before the eighteen different nationalities that will meet at Eisenach in August can enter into "an international affiliation of Lutheran forces that will function and prove effective, . . . a working basis of faith unity must be established. It is of the utmost importance that the eighteen different branches of the Lutheran Church, which have hitherto been more or less out of doctrinal and practical touch with each other, as if they had been eighteen different denominations, should examine the faith foundations upon which they profess to rest, and find a common ground on which to stand." An official declaration like the foregoing from the leading American body which will take part in the Eisenach Conference — if it did not actually bring this conference about — raises great hopes. The method here proposed is, as the editor says, "the first thing to be attained. The rest will then follow. It is not only the Lutheran mode of procedure; it is the right mode, the Scriptural mode." What will be attempted at Eisenach, if the program of the *Lutheran* is adopted, is a restatement of the Lutheran faith in terms of the twentieth century. Of the existing Lutheran Confessions — we take this to mean the Book of Concord — the editor says: "They register what the Lutheran Church in a great crisis had to witness in defense of the truth as over against prevailing errors. We accept that witness, but not as the final word in settling questions that new methods of attack against the faith have thrust upon us to-day, questions which the Confessions do not touch. The faith of the Church is a living thing. It is a well of water gushing forth from the living Fountain, the Word of God. The moment it is looked upon as a fixed and settled thing it becomes a stagnant pool, and the Church cannot live and fulfil its mission on that kind of water." There may be occasions in the life of the Church where a new and specific confession is required to meet new errors. Our Synod faced such an issue when it adopted its Thirteen Theses to declare the Lutheran faith regarding the doctrines of election and conversion. But even on such occasions the new statement goes back to the old standards of teaching. They are indeed to be looked upon as "a fixed and settled thing." That is what subscription to them means; otherwise, what is there to attach the subscription to? A restatement of doctrine is

a *re*statement only when it states the old doctrines again; otherwise it is a new statement, by which the original statement is superseded, somewhat like the process by which an organization may put its constitution practically out of existence by smothering it with amendments. The Lutheran Confessions emphasize the supreme and sole authority of Holy Scripture for determining men's faith: "The object of the Augustana, as stated in its preface, was to show 'what manner of doctrine has been set forth in our lands and churches from the Holy Scriptures and the pure Word of God.' And in its conclusion the Lutheran confessors declare: 'Nothing has been received on our part against Scripture or the Church Catholic,' and 'we are ready, God willing, to present ampler information according to the Scriptures.' '*Juxta Scripturam*' — such are the closing words of the Augsburg Confession. The Lutheran Church knows of no other principle. In the Formula of Concord we read: 'Other writings, however, of ancient or modern teachers, whatever name they bear, must not be regarded as equal to the Holy Scriptures, but all of them together be subjected to them, and [they] should not be received otherwise or further than as witnesses [which are to show] in what manner, after the time of the apostles, and at what places this doctrine of the prophets and apostles was preserved.' (777, 2.) In the conclusion of the Catalog of Testimonies we read: 'The true saving faith is to be founded upon no church-teachers, old or new, but only and alone upon God's Word, which is comprised in the Scriptures of the prophets and holy apostles, as unquestionable witnesses of divine truth.' (1149.)" (*Triglot Concordia,* p. 7.) This rule the Lutheran confessors applied to their own declarations of faith, which were drawn from "the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments *as the pure, clear fountain of Israel.*" (*Ibid.,* p. 851.) That is what gives them perennial freshness and enduring normative power. There is no danger of stagnation in accepting them as a fixed and settled thing. A close study of the Lutheran Confessions, moreover, leads to the often surprising discovery that many of the issues of modern church-life have been judged in advance in these documents. Modern church-life exhibits many novelties, but little that is really new. The *Lutheran* anticipates a peaceful discussion of Lutheran doctrine and practise at Eisenach. May its expectation be fully realized! Until the *personnel* of the convention is known, it is impossible to say to what extent this expectation is justified. It is possible that the discussion will be as troubled and disharmonious as it would be, were the conference to take up the occupation of the Ruhr District and kindred matters for debate. But even if it should become disagreeable, it can still be honorable. Smoothness and pleasantness in conducting a discussion on such important matters as Lutheran faith and practise are not the greatest boon to be desired for the convention. Unflinching fidelity and frankest sincerity are a greater blessing. — The remarks of the editor foreshadow that the conference will also take up for discussion practical questions created by the ravages of the late war, and devise a way of cooperation for solving them. If American Lutherans can cooperate with the Federal Council of Churches, they will

also find a way for such cooperation with Lutherans of other countries. Perhaps the definite tangible result of the conference will be just this cooperation in works of charity and benevolence. — The *Lutheran* asks that the conference be made the subject of prayer. Inasmuch as the acts of the conference may affect the entire Lutheran Church of the world, every member of our Church will make the conference his concern and pray that the outcome of it may redound to the honor and prosperity of true Lutheranism. Particularly do those members of the conference need the prayers of all lovers of our Lutheran Zion who have undertaken to represent America among the eighteen nationalities that will participate in this conference. D.

BOOK REVIEW.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.: —

Popular Commentary of the Bible. Book 1. *Old Testament.* Vol. I: Genesis to Esther. *Paul E. Kretzmann, Ph. D., D. D.* 798 pages. $5.00, postpaid.

The two New Testament volumes of Dr. Kretzmann's *Commentary* have for some time been on the market and have been well received. The first volume of the Old Testament is now ready. It contains the entire historical section, from Genesis to Esther. The publisher's note says: "It was necessary, for obvious reasons, to use a briefer form of commentary in treating so much material, but we feel satisfied that this has not been done at the expense of usefulness. In fact, we believe that the combination of the style of the Weimar Bible and of Dr. Stoeckhardt's *Bible Histories* has worked out successfully. There are no special articles included, but users of the book will find that all important passages, such as the Messianic prophecies, have been treated sufficiently in detail for all ordinary purposes. As in the New Testament, the original text has been consulted throughout." Two maps especially prepared for this volume are included. The second volume of the Old Testament is now on the press, and soon, the Lord willing, all four volumes, or the complete *Commentary*, may be purchased. Some of our lay-members have been clamoring for just such a commentary, and we therefore expect that not only pastors and teachers in our parochial schools, who will find the *Commentary* a very handy reference work, but also Sunday-school teachers and many of our lay-members will purchase the complete set. However, if this is to be done, our pastors will have to bring the *Commentary* to the attention of their people and urge them to buy and read it. FRITZ.

Statistical Year-Book of the Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States for the Year 1922. 198 pages. $1.00, postpaid.

The *Statistical Year-Book* gives statistical information as to the officers of Synod, reports of presidents, parochial reports, Lutheran church-bodies in America, language used in services, schools, educational institutions, etc., etc., all of which speaks a language of its own. The low price of one dollar does not pay for the cost of production. FRITZ.

The Macmillan Company, New York, N. Y.: —

The Origin of Paul's Religion. The James Sprunt Lectures delivered at Union Theological Seminary in Virginia. *J. Gresham Machen,* D. D., assistant professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary. $1.75.

In these days, when many books are published on religious subjects, it is refreshing to find one which can be recommended. Such a book is Professor Machen's *The Origin of Paul's Religion.* In a scholarly and masterly manner Professor Machen deals with the critics of Paul and proves that their charges cannot stand, but that Paul's religion is the religion of Jesus Christ, the God-man and Savior of the world.

In his introduction Professor Machen says: "Explain the origin of the religion of Paul, and you have solved the problem of the origin of Christianity. . . . Even apart from any detailed investigation, however, one difference between the religion of Paul and the Oriental religions is perfectly obvious. The Oriental religions were tolerant of other faiths; the religion of Paul, like the ancient religion of Israel, demanded an absolutely exclusive devotion. A man could become initiated into the mysteries of Isis or Mithras without at all giving up his former beliefs; but if he were to be received into the Church, according to the preaching of Paul, he must forsake all other saviors for the Lord Jesus Christ. . . . If Paul had been a liberal Jew, he would never have been the Apostle to the Gentiles; for he would never have developed his doctrine of the Cross. Gentile freedom, in other words, was not, according to Paul, a relaxing of strict requirements in the interests of practical missionary work; it was a matter of principle. . . . Christianity could not live without theology. And the first great Christian theologian was Paul. . . . In dealing with the Apostle Paul we are dealing with one of the moving factors of the world's history. . . . The religion of Paul was rooted altogether in the redeeming work of Jesus Christ. Jesus, for Paul, was primarily not a Revealer, but a Savior."

In his chapter on "Paul and Jesus" the author writes: "The Pauline epistles contain not the slightest trace of any conflict with regard to the person of Christ. . . . The paucity of references in the Pauline epistles to the teaching and example of Jesus has sometimes been exaggerated. The epistles attest considerable knowledge of the details of Jesus' life and warm appreciation of His character." The merely human Jesus of modern liberalism Professor Machen calls a *monstrosity.* He says: "Two difficulties face the reconstruction of the liberal Jesus. In the first place, it is difficult to separate the natural from the supernatural in the Gospel-picture of Jesus; and in the second place, after the separation has been accomplished, the human Jesus who is left is found to be a monstrosity, with a contradiction at the very center of His being. Such a Jesus, it may fairly be maintained, could never have existed on earth. . . . The religion of Paul is a religion of redemption. Jesus, according to Paul, came to earth not to say something, but to do something; He was primarily not a teacher, but a Redeemer. He came, not to teach men how to live, but to give them a new life through His atoning death. He was, indeed, also a teacher, and Paul attended to His teaching. But His teaching

was all in vain unless it led to the final acceptance of His redemptive work. Not the details of Jesus' life, therefore, but the redemptive acts of death and resurrection are at the center of the religion of Paul. The teaching and example of Jesus, according to Paul, are valuable only as a means to an end, valuable in order that through a revelation of Jesus' character saving faith may be induced, and valuable thereafter in order that the saving work may be brought to its fruition in holy living. But all that Jesus said and did was for the purpose of the Cross. 'He loved me,' says Paul, 'and gave Himself for me.' This is the heart and core of the religion of Paul. . . . Everywhere in the epistles, moreover, the attitude of Paul toward Christ is not merely the attitude of man to man or scholar to master; it is the attitude of man toward God."

Discussing the question whether Paul perhaps received his religion from pagan sources, Professor Machen writes: "This difference is intimately connected with a highly significant fact — the presence in Paul of a 'forensic' view of salvation. Salvation, according to Paul, is not only salvation from the power of sin; it is also salvation from the guilt of sin. Not only regeneration is needed if a man is to be saved, but also justification. At this point there is apparently in the mystery religions no parallel worthy of the name."

The following words, with which Professor Machen closes his discussion of 317 pages, characterize his book: "The religion of Paul was not founded upon a complex of ideas derived from Judaism or from paganism. It was founded upon the historical Jesus. But the historical Jesus upon whom it was founded was not the Jesus of modern reconstruction, but the Jesus of the whole New Testament and of Christian faith; not a teacher who survived only in the memory of His disciples, but the Savior who, after His redeeming work was done, still lived and could still be loved."

These few excerpts may suffice. We cannot enter upon the detailed and scholarly examination to which Professor Machen subjects his critics. For three reasons we recommend that our readers purchase and study Professor Machen's book: first, because of its scholarly examination of the subject under consideration and the sound principles maintained; secondly, because it gives to the reader a comprehensive presentation of the whole life and work of Paul; thirdly, because it is a testimony that among the many men who in our day are, by their false teaching, trying to destroy the old Christian faith, there are still to be found those who are convinced that the old Gospel must stand and also have the courage to voice their conviction.

As to the doctrine of the Sacraments, Professor Machen adheres to the Reformed view. To him the Sacraments are merely "an outward sign of an inner experience," and not means of grace. He charges Luther with "overliteralness" in insisting that the words of Christ in the Lord's Supper be taken to teach the real presence of Christ's body and blood. He says that this "overliteralness" of Luther was "fraught with disastrous consequences for the Church and is deserted by most advocates of the grammatico-historical method of exegesis." Professor Machen is not willing that Luther's "overliteralness" be applied to what the Scripture says of the blessings of the Sacraments. Professor Machen seems to think that we have an *ex opere operato* conception of the Sacraments. In this

he is, of course, mistaken. In discussing the question of the relation of Paul's religion to pagan religions, he says: "The argument depends upon one particular view of the Pauline sacraments; it depends upon the view that Baptism and the Lord's Supper were conceived of as conveying blessing not in virtue of the disposition of soul with which they were administered or received, but in virtue of the sacramental acts themselves. In other words (to use traditional language), the argument depends upon the view that the Pauline sacraments conveyed their blessing not *ex opere operantis* but *ex opere operato*."

Professor Machen evidently does not distinguish between the giving of the blessing through the Sacrament by God and the receiving of such blessing through faith by man. He argues that, if the blessing of the Sacrament is received by faith, then *the Sacrament itself* does not convey that blessing, and that, if any one teaches that it does, he necessarily has an *ex opere operato* conception of the Sacrament. This argument, however, cannot hold good. According to the Reformed view the Holy Spirit acts *immediately* upon the soul from within and not through certain means which God has appointed. This leaves it a mere matter of speculation as to when and where the Holy Spirit operates. God, however, has given us His Word and Sacraments as means whereby He gives His blessings and whereby the Holy Spirit operates in the heart of man. Through the Gospel God offers forgiveness of sin to all who hear it, but the forgiveness can be received only by faith. Even so through the Sacraments God offers forgiveness of sin, but only by faith such forgiveness can be received. Whether or not God's blessing is *given* through the Gospel and the Sacraments does not depend upon man's faith, but *upon God's promise;* he only, however, receives that blessing who accepts it by faith. The blessing is there also for the unbeliever; but the unbeliever does not receive it, not because it is not there for him, but because he by his unbelief refuses to accept it. Neither Luther nor our Lutheran Church has taught that the Sacraments convey their blessings *ex opere operato*. As to Baptism, our Lutheran Church teaches in its Catechism that "it works forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and gives eternal salvation *to all who believe this, as the words and promises of God declare*." In answer to the question, "How can water do such great things?" our Catechism says: "It is not the water indeed that does them, but the *word of God* which is in and with the water, and *faith*, which trusts such word of God in the water. For without the word of God the water is simple water, and no Baptism. But with the word of God it is a Baptism, that is, a gracious water of life and a washing of regeneration in the Holy Ghost, as St. Paul says, Titus, chapter third: By the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ, our Savior, that, being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life. This is a faithful saying." As to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, our Lutheran Church, answering the question, "What is the benefit of such eating and drinking?" says: "That is shown us *by these words, 'Given and shed for you for the remission of sins';* namely, that in the Sacrament forgiveness of sin, life, and salvation *are given us through these words.* For where there is forgiveness of sin, there is also life and salvation." And to the question,

"How can bodily eating and drinking do such great things?" our Catechism answers: "It is not the eating and drinking, indeed, that does them, but the *words here writen, 'Given and shed for you for the remission of sins'*; which words, beside the bodily eating and drinking, are as the chief thing in the Sacrament; and *he that believes these words has what they say and express, namely, the forgiveness of sins.*" What our Lutheran Catechism teaches we believe to be the Scriptural doctrine of the Sacraments. The Biblical doctrine of the means of grace is so plainly stated that even Professor Machen, lapsing from his own Reformed position, was constrained to express it when, in another connection, he writes that Baptism is "an external sign which is made the vehicle of special blessing." That is exactly what our Lutheran Church teaches, to wit, that the Sacrament is a *vehicle* of God's blessing. If it is a vehicle, then it is more than *a mere outward sign* of an inner blessing, for then it *brings* to man that very blessing; whether or not man receives it by faith, that is another question. The mere act of being baptized and the mere act of partaking of Christ's body and blood does not impart divine forgiveness; but that does not say that, *as far as God is concerned*, forgiveness has not by Him been actually offered in the Sacrament. When Peter says: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" (Acts 2, 38), he certainly teaches that Baptism is to be administered for the remission of sins. The Lutheran doctrine of the right use of the Sacraments is taught in the following words of the Augsburg Confession: "De usu sacramentorum docent, quod sacramenta instituta sint, non modo ut sint notae professionis inter homines, sed magis ut sint signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos *ad excitandam et confirmandam fidem* in his, qui utuntur, proposita. Itaque utendum est sacramentis ita, ut fides *accedat*, quae credat promissionibus, quae per sacramenta exhibentur et ostenduntur. Damnant igitur illos, qui docent, quod sacramenta *ex opere operato* justificent, nec docent, *fidem requiri* in usu sacramentorum, *quae credat remitti peccata.*" ("Of the use of the Sacraments they teach that the Sacraments were ordained, not only to be marks of profession among men, but rather to be signs and testimonies of the will of God toward us, instituted *to awaken and confirm faith* in those who use them. Wherefore we must so use the Sacraments that faith *be added* to believe the promises which are offered and set forth through the Sacraments. They therefore condemn those who teach that the Sacraments justify *by the outward act*, and who do not teach that, in the use of the Sacraments, *faith which believes that sins are forgiven is required.*" — Art. 13.) FRITZ.

George H. Doran Co., New York, N. Y.: —

The Art of Preaching in the Light of Its History. *Rev. Edwin Charles Dargan, D. D., LL. D.* 247 pages, 5¼×7¾. $1.75, net.

"Homiletics," says Dr. Dargan, "needs and deserves a new appraisement. It is worthy of a more scientific study and treatment than it usually finds among those who teach and learn it, and it is entitled to far more respectful consideration than it ever has received from thinkers in the wider ranges of general science. The importance of preaching in history and in existing social conditions would seem to justify, if not demand,

a better attitude toward the theory of preaching." The author treats the historical development of preaching, giving also the bibliography. The large number of books published in recent years on homiletics, or the art of preaching, is an indication that the importance of the sermon is not being lost sight of. Let us, however, not forget that the first requisite of a good sermon is that it be Biblical. This having been granted, the make-up and the delivery of the sermon deserves all the attention it can be given. FRITZ.

The Sunday-School Times Co., Philadelphia, Pa.: —

How to Speak Effectively without Notes. *Robert E. Speer.* 5×7½. 25 cts.

This booklet of twenty-eight pages contains very valuable hints for effective public speaking. Among other things, the author urges preachers to study their Bible for the sake of its contents and to procure a good vocabulary. As to public speech, the author says that it is "simply private speech before a somewhat larger company — conversation on a larger stage." We recommend the booklet to our pastors. FRITZ.

Publishing House M. E. Church, South, Nashville, Tenn.: —

Chapel Talks. *John Carlisle Kilgo,* former President of Trinity College and Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Collected and edited by *D. W. Newsom,* Treasurer of Trinity College. 173 pages, 5¼×7¾. $1.25.

We give a few samples to show what Dr. Kilgo in his chapel talks offered to his students. In an "Address of Welcome on the Opening of College" he said: "I have just said something about your entrance into college and your preparation in Latin, Greek, Mathematics, etc.; but there is another preparation that is of much higher value, of greater importance than this. It is the preparation that your mother started to give you the first time she bent you at her knee and said over your bowed head, 'Now I lay me down to sleep.' Some of you have brought no other evening prayer with you than 'Now I lay me down to sleep' — that indicates inner preparation of high honor and high integrity and true manhood and purity. We look very closely into your faces, for we want to see whether they are clean faces. Is that young man prepared to have all the rights of college; is he prepared to have a roommate; is he prepared to be trusted on the streets; is he prepared to be trusted out of sight; to be trusted by his parents away from home? That is the most important preparation. This is a great time for you to vow a very great vow to yourself, and I trust you will do it. If you have been taught to pray and to attend church, do not think that being a Freshman in college has released you from it. Start right. Last night was your first night in college. Did you do as you did at home — bow by your bedside and commit yourself to God before retiring, or did you say, 'I am in college now; a college boy cannot afford to pray; that will do for the folks at home'? If you did, you made a terrible stride toward ruin. . . . One other point. I hope your Bibles are on your tables. I pity any young man who came to college without his Bible, and I pity a mother who allowed her son to come to college

without a Bible. If you never read your Bible, read it now. There is no wall around Trinity College. Evil is here as everywhere. Hide yourself behind your Bible. Next Sunday morning I hope to see you in your places in church. There is a spirit to-day that promises to make church-haters. The greatest strength in America is church fidelity. When that is gone, there is nothing to stand on."

In a talk on "The Dollar" Dr. Kilgo said: "Do you know how to handle a dollar, young man? Have you learned how sacred a dollar is? ... If you are the son of a farmer, or a merchant, or a lawyer, or a doctor, or a preacher, you will know how he came to have it. Behind it are days of toil, fatigue, anxiety, and much sacrifice. The blood of your father and of your mother is in a very true sense on that dollar they sent you. ... Should not money from home be the finest money, the dearest money, and the hardest money to spend? When you go from this room, take the dollar out of your pocket and look at the tired face of your father and the weary form of your mother on it, and I am sure you will set on it a new value and guard it with a new care."

In a talk on "Ruffianism" we read: "Because a man is young, it does not follow that he should be a hoodlum, ruffian, or a fool. Neither do I see any reason why the fact that a man is a student in a college excuses him from being a gentleman. . . . Because you are a college student, is it true that the public expects to find all that is common and low and coarse in you? No, young men, this public attitude is an insult to every college man in the land. It should be resented as an insult. No decent man should dare accept its protection. And I say, no decent man will accept it. Such an excuse may be made for idiots, and unless college students are willing to rank as idiots, they should not hide behind an idiot's refuge. Because you are college students, the world has a just right to expect the best of everything from you; and if you are not disposed to give it, the law should handle you with rough hands. There is no reason why a boot-black should be sent by a court to the roads for taking a gate from the hinges, and the same community laugh at a set of college boys doing the same deed, as though they were imbeciles. The time has come when colleges should be required to make a show of their right to exist by the superior example in everything set by them. If they know more than other people, then they should do better than other people. Think on these things, young men, and let your conduct be such as becomes educated gentlemen. Get for your college the reputation of being a college of gentlemen and for gentlemen."

In a talk on "The Mission of a College" Dr. Kilgo remarked: "The service a college renders the world must be measured by the height to which it raises a few men. The quality of citizens is of vastly more importance to a commonwealth than is the number of them. China with its millions and millions has no such history as lies behind the Greeks. To be the rendezvous of a multitude is a false ambition for a college, but to be a community of working students and teachers is a praiseworthy aim. I am frank to say that there are not lacking in American colleges signs which strain the confidence of thoughtful men. Steadily there have grown up in our educational communities customs and sentiments which beget just suspicions. The spirit of play has become alarmingly great, while the

spirit of work has seemingly declined. A class of pedagogical adventurers have conceived the scheme of reducing education to a happy outing and a prolonged frolic. It is not difficult to see why their shallow philosophies should gain favor among the young; but the way to knowledge is still a steep, a long, and a hard way, only passed over by those who have courage and endurance. Men who work hard and economize closely to send their sons to college fail to understand why they should toil that their sons may frolic. And no sane man can show them a sound reason for such an arrangement."

We cannot agree with Dr. Kilgo when, in a talk on "Christ as an Educator," he stated: "As Christ looked over a world sunk in sin, He saw that the one thing it needed was education in righteousness. To give that education was His task. He founded a school. He took for His students twelve men, untaught in the traditions of the learning of the day." No amount of education in righteousness could have helped a world sunk in sin. What the world needed was a Savior from sin, and Christ is that Savior. "God made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." 2 Cor. 5, 21. We can, however, agree with Dr. Kilgo when, in the same chapel talk, he says: "Let us not measure a college by its buildings or its enrolment. I am often asked, 'How many students have you at Trinity?' as though I were running a stock-farm. Some people measure a college by its baseball or its football team. This has become a favorite mode of advertising with some institutions. It is a false standard."

The book contains over fifty chapel talks. Some of the subjects, besides those already mentioned, are: Telling the Truth, Leadership, Walking with God, The Prodigal Son, Small Things, The Faith of Moses' Mother, Examinations, A Call to the Ministry, Conduct in College, Idleness, Companions, Faith, A Holiday. FRITZ.

The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, Pa.: —

The Coming of the Slav. *Charles Eugene Edwards.* 148 pages. Paper cover, 50 cts.; cloth, 75 cts., postpaid.

The purpose of this booklet is to encourage Presbyterians to use their influence to evangelize the many millions of Slavs in Europe. In the foreword we read: "No Slav land has so many evangelicals as Czechoslovakia. No other is rated so high for intelligence and culture. No other has so intense an admiration for its great Reformer, John Huss. Thus there is 'a spark of Protestantism in every Bohemian.' A far greater movement than *Los von Rom* (Away from Rome) of some years ago, is progressing in Bohemia and Moravia toward the ideals of Huss and the Hussites. America helped Czechoslovakia to win her present liberty, after a thraldom of centuries. Christian America should now help these seekers after a Savior to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. No Christians in America have done more for Slavs than the Presbyterians, especially in the work of colportage, which is illustrated in portions of this book." Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, Slovakia, and Ruthenia (Rusinia) are the divisions of Czechoslovakia. FRITZ.